

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER (Small Entity)Applicant(s): **Deavila**

Docket No.

15658.2

Application No.

09/876,550

Filing Date

June 7, 2001

Examiner

Frank B. Vanaman

Customer No.

022913

Group Art Unit

3618

Confirmation No.

7541Invention: **MOBILE SAFETY COMPLIANCE APPARATUS****COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:**

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST # PREV. PAID FOR	NUMBER EXTRA CLAIMS PRESENT	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS	-	20 =	0 x	\$9.00	\$0.00
INDEP. CLAIMS	-	3 =	0 x	\$44.00	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/>					\$0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$0.00

- ☐ No additional fee is required for amendment.
- ☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. _____ in the amount of _____
- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **23-3178**
- ☒ Any additional filing fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16.
- ☒ Any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17.
- ☒ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.


SignatureDated: **December 21, 2004**

I certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on

December 21, 2004.

(Date)



Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Mindyn L. McCurdy

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

cc:



Express Mail Label No.: EV 524683974 US

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	09/876,550	Confirmation No. 7541
Applicant	:	Pericles Deavila	
Filed:	:	June 7, 2001	
TC/A.U.:	:	3618	
Examiner	:	Frank Bennett Vanaman	
Docket No.	:	15658.2	
Customer No.	:	022913	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT "C" AND RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Dear Commissioner for Patents:

In response to the Final Office action of July 21, 2004, Applicant submits the following amendment and response. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 21, 22, 25, 26, 31, 109, 110, 119, 120, 124, 125 and 137 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Pool (U.S. Patent No. 5,702,115). Claims 2, 4, 7, 30, 111, 122, 123, 133, 134 and 136 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Rigo (U.S. Patent No. 5,820,143). Claims 8, 9, 37, 112 and 113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Walker (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,949). Claims 10 and 121 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Kos (U.S. Patent No. 5,833,330). Claims 11, 12, 14, 17, 114, 126 and 127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No. 5,518,258). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Tisbo et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,975,660). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox and Insalaco et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,605,344). Claims 18-20, 38, 115 and 138-148 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Stein (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,626). Claims 23, 32-35, 116, 118, 128, 129, 131, 149 and 151 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Silva (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,302). Claims 27, 28 and 132 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No. 6,220,610). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox ('610) and Haley (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,929). Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Stein and Silva. Claims 117 and 150 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Haley. Claim 130 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Silva and Haley. Claim 135 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Tagg (U.S. Design No. 391,343). Claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Kaish et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,928). Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 21 of this paper.